

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
OCALA DIVISION**

FLOYD STEVE BALES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 5:21-cv-496-MMH-PRL

BRIGHT SOLAR
MARKETING LLC,

Defendant.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 73; Report), entered by the Honorable Philip Lammens, United States Magistrate Judge, on August 15, 2023. In the Report, Judge Lammens recommends that the Motion of Defendant Bright Solar Marketing LLC to Determine Entitlement to Attorneys' Fees and Costs (Dkt. No. 61) be denied and that Defendant's Amended Bill of Costs (Dkt. No. 69) be granted to the extent that Defendant be awarded \$7,152.64 in costs. See Report at 18. No objections to the Report have been filed, and the time for doing so has now passed.

The Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

Pursuant to Rule 72, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (Rule(s)), the Court “must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” See Rule 72(b)(3); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, a party waives the right to challenge on appeal any unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions. See 11th Cir. R. 3-1.¹ As such, the Court reviews those portions of the Magistrate Judge’s findings to which no objection was filed for plain error and only if necessary, in the interests of justice. See id.; see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate [judge’s] factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”); Dupree v. Warden, 715 F.3d 1295, 1304-05 (11th Cir. 2013) (recommending the adoption of what would become 11th Circuit Rule 3-1 so that district courts do not have “to spend significant amounts of time and resources reviewing every issue—whether objected to or not.”).

Upon independent review of the file and for the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge’s Report, the Court will accept and adopt the legal and factual conclusions recommended by the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is hereby

¹ The Magistrate Judge properly informed the parties of the time period for objecting and the consequences of failing to do so. See Report at 1 n.1.

ORDERED:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 73) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.
2. The Motion of Defendant Bright Solar Marketing LLC to Determine Entitlement to Attorneys' Fees and Costs (Dkt. No. 61) is **DENIED**.
3. Defendant's Amended Bill of Costs (Dkt. No. 69) is **GRANTED** to the extent that Defendant is awarded \$7,152.64 in costs.
4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter the Amended Bill of Costs in the amount of \$7,152.64.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers this 5th day of September, 2023.


MARCIA MORALES HOWARD
United States District Judge

ja

Copies to:

Counsel of Record